DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 869 SO 012 204

AUTHOR Wilson, Everett K.
TITLE The Scholarly Route to Becoming a Teacher of Sociology.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 26p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Boston, MA, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Organization; Educational Assessment; *Educational Needs; *Educational Practice; Effective Teaching; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Intellectual Disciplines; *Needs Assessment; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; *Sociology; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

The paper considers how research and teaching of sociology will be improved if sociology graduate students receive training with a different emphasis. The major problem besetting sociology education centers on the dominance of quantitative techniques. This technical dominance in the field of sociology has resulted in excluding: subject matter, skill in detecting analytically similar situations, and ability to apply general principles to an individual case. Specific problems in graduate training of sociologists in colleges and universities include premature specialization, failure of departments to transmit an understanding of the entire discipline, and lack of emphasis on integrating sociology with other disciplines. Sociology education will be improved if students are provided background in mathematics, history, literature, and a biological or physical science and if they are shown how sociology can contribute to these and other disciplines. Further, sociology graduate programs should devote more time to studying the social world with which students are familiar. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Everett K. Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED180869

E SCHOLARLY ROUTE TO BECOMING A TEACHER OF SOCIOLOGY*

Everett K. Wilson

The University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

For most whom we teach, sociology is a means, not an end. For most of us who teach, sociology is an end in itself, the search for adequate explanations of differing social patterns. For 90 percent of those we teach, sociology is pertinent only as it bears on their pasts and futures and most of all, as it sheds light on their present lives--their work and play and other studies. For most students, that is to say, sociology instruction is seen as one element in a general education. For the instructor it comes closer to being essential training for solving problems that are inevitably social, both in origin and impact. If you will accept hyperbole to sharpen the point, the contrast (teacher and student) is between seeing sociology as the whole or the part, as end or means, as training in a discipline or as education toward some larger end.

Becoming a teacher of sociology typically starts with training--and sometimes ends there. By training I mean the development of those skills essential to such professions as the law, medicine, the Bureau of the Census and industrial research. In the 20s and 30s and 40s, sociologists particularly needed training in quantitative methods; for they came to their graduate work from backgrounds and impulses more akin to the humanities than the biophysical sciences. Hence, a compensatory stress on what amounted to remedial mathematics and elementary statistics.

SP 012 204

*A paper presented at the annual meetings of the ASA, Boston, 1979.

It is hard to believe how recently Means, SDs, Pearson r's and Spearman rhos made up the technical kit of the sociologist--and how much training went into such modest outcomes, training with the help of those marvels, the Marchant and Friden calculators and the lumbering Hollerith machines. It is hard to believe, too, how wonderfully optimistic we were with such modest tools, with Thurstone and Likert and Guttman scales and the happy prospect of explaining the social world with linear, zero-order correlations.

If the emphasis on training stemmed first from our deficiencies, the stress was later amplified owing to the ever faster development and diffusion of new methods--factor analysis, regression analysis, path analytic ways of expressing type and extent of connections among variables, more adequate experimental designs, new methods of categorical data analysis, log linear analysis, smallest space analysis, network analysis, historiography, and reflexive studies of the studier (related to the rediscovery of phenomenology and the resurrection of Mead, Dewey and Bentley in a concern about the effect of the knower on the known). These developments have occurred, mostly, since WW II, over a generation whose cohorts had no better background than those of the 20s and 30s. Ill prepared, then, and self-selected from among the softer aspirants,[1] graduate students have faced a vastly extended range of technical requirements. These circumstances, together with the expectation of empirical research embodied in theses and dissertations, led to a preoccupation with techniques and tactics. What should be taken for granted as a minimum technical base for research and teaching[2] has come, necessarily to dominate the graduate scene. Essential but belatedly taught techniques have elbowed out the

substance of the field. Training, that is to say, has supplanted education. But training alone is not an effective way of learning to teach sociology to most of our students. (Nor is it an effective route for fruitful research in sociology. Competent technicians may make sorry scientists.)

Scholarly preparation for effective sociology instruction does not gainsay the need for skills of inquiry any more than it would deny the need for literacy, a quality in which we are sometimes equally deficient. It would take such skills as prerequisite--or at least the matter of technical competence would not so dominate professional preparation as to exclude matters of substance, extension and application. By substance, I mean command of subject matter, but a very special sort of command; one in which any particular inquiry is seen against the backdrop of a synoptic comprehension of the field; and the field itself is seen in the context of a wider range of art and science. By extension, I mean a cultivated--and transmittable--skill in detecting situations and populations that are analytically isomorphic. And by application, I mean the ability, the transmittable ability, as in law or medicine, to apply to the individual case general principles that help resolve the issue at hand.

Command of the field: Integration

One characteristic of training, in contrast to education, is its narrowness. My impression is that, with the proliferation of fields in sociology, we have suffered premature specialization among graduate students. One effect is the disjuncture between special interests and the larger field of which they are a part. The failure of articulation is then passed on in the mis-instruction of undergraduates who, constrained to see sociology as a set of unconnected fragments in a random series of ephemeral interests, are fated never to see the forest for the trees. A specialist in, say, the family

or the sociology of religion, may be innocent of the generic notion of institutions; may, indeed, confuse the concept of organization with that of institution. (I have seen manuscripts from certified sociologists who write that way, confusing the particular with the general, the species with the genus.) Thus age, sex and race were initially treated by demographers as biological traits, quite independent of their social and psychic connotations. In the past two decades, race and gender were treated chiefly as bases for social movements, only tardily becoming assimilated to generic issues of differentiation, along dimensions of power, privilege and scope of choice.[3] Age, too, was narrowly treated as an aspect of demographic composition until Riley, Foner and associates approached it as a dimension of stratification. The sociology of science, or of aesthetic expression, or of morality--these remain unassimilated to social psychology, the analysis of structural features affecting psychic states (cognition, feeling, judgment, preference). Specialization differentiates and isolates realms that need integration. Rural sociology is separated from urban, although each uses the other's data as benchmarks. The innocent contagion of Wallerstein through Braudel remains unassimilated to the basic ecological perspective suggested by von Thünen's (19) Die isolierte Stadt im Beziehung des Hinterlands. Such separation of cognate specialties makes for good training among those destined for work with research agencies, applied or theoretical. But it makes for bad education among those destined to teach sociology. For such a task, sociology is a means, not an end (perhaps the best available means) for developing a

cultivated human being. For most undergraduates, the college experience is the first and last chance to put the world together in comprehensible fashion. They are exposed to a great range of ideas and information. (Distribution requirements commonly impose such exposures.) Integration then becomes a very tough problem. One can't be very helpful by teaching a course in Optics, rather than Physics. Nor can one be helpful by teaching one of sociology's 40+ specialties, to the neglect of sociology. Adequate scholarly preparation for teaching sociology requires a synoptic view of the field, even though the course at issue is a narrowly defined specialty. Adequate preparation for teaching warns us to beware of exclusive preoccupation with the part, denying students some vision of the whole. Yet, beguiled by the attractions of the sideroads, it is easy to forget, to neglect, indeed, never to discover, the main thoroughfares from which local traffic peels off.

Our students need some sense of the discipline, its boundaries and core elements for the same reason that we cannot call each blade of grass by a separate name. Knowledge is possible only through taxonomies that summarize an otherwise bewildering range of things. In the absence of discernible boundaries, undergraduates will never know where they are. Nor can they connect--integrate--knowledge from different realms--dealing with people and dealing with things, social organization environment and technology--in ignorance of the boundaries of those realms.

I know it is said that sociology cannot be bounded, so varied and incompatible are sociologists' views, so heterogeneous are its disparate realms of inquiry. I believe this is false. I believe, also that such a view stems from poor graduate education (however excellent the training).

For centuries students of social life have divided their work into statics and dynamics, structure (or composition) and change. For centuries the task has been description of differing social patterns and explanation of those differences. The structures, or patterns have been subclassified: demographic structures, the structure of the labor force, the spatial and temporal structures that emerge as populations adapt to habitats, institutional structures, structures of power, wealth and prestige--i.e., the structures revealed in stratification. Explanations of differences in time and space (of social change) differ, of course. That is the very raison d'etre for all intellectual domains: they exist to generate more adequate explanations. The fact that some investigate resistances to change while others study antithetical interests, conflicting beliefs and behaviors does not mean disagreement on the nature of the field. The view that the field lacks integrity overlooks, too, the overlap in positions whose differences are exaggerated. Consider, for example, Simmel's functional theory of conflict and the quite explicit functionalism of Marx.

And so I think it possible as well as necessary that preparation for sociology instruction should include a synoptic view of the field, ensuring that, later, the undergraduate will see the whole in which the part is set.

But this is not enough. If sociology is a means, not an end for the student, if it is to be part of some more or less integrated whole in the student's intellectual experience, then sociology instruction should exploit and contribute to the student's work in other fields (See Wilson, 1971:viii). In the liberal arts tradition, sociology should

liberally exploit other disciplines: mathematics, other languages, and other of the sciences . . . for most [students]--those having but a single go at sociology--the important thing is to see the mutually fructifying influence of sociology and their other intellectual interests. One would hope for the result suggested by the rector of Justin (in the Auchincloss novel, 1964)--but with sociology added to the list.

> "An equation, a Keats ode, a Gothic cathedral, a Mozart aria, the explosion of gases in a laboratory, they should be seen by [students] as related--and divine."

What does this imply for the scholarly route to the teaching of sociology? It seems very clear that the teacher-to-be needs background in mathematics, history, literature and a biological or physical science--enough background to tap these fields in support of sociology; and to show sociology's contribution to them. The task is so to weave sociology into the fabric of students' development as to help create a view of the world in which each part contributes to a richer whole. Butler's The Way of All Flesh is not only good reading; it is good literature because it is an authentic study in middle class, 19th century socialization. Conrad's Heart of Darkness provides vivid insights into the condition psychologists call sensory deprivation, i.e., the effects of isolation. Watson's The Double Helix discloses the intimate, competitive network of scientists (some scientists) at work. Moliere's (16) Bourgeois Gentilhomme tells us something about the subtle concomitants of class and the problems of upward mobility. Van Woodward, the historian, speaks more effectively to race and regionalism and social change--and resistance to it--than many

a sociological study. (See his The Strange Case of Jim Crow.) Tolstoy speaks provocatively about leadership and social networks when he writes (18 , Book 9, Sec. 1) that "A king is history's slave" and, again, "The higher a man stands on the social ladder, the more people he is connected with and the more power he has over others, the more evident is the predestination and inevitability of his every action." And speaking to the simple analytical device of dichotomized nominal variables, Troyat (19) writes of the four Tolstoy brothers and their commitment to their studies: one was willing and able, a second was willing but unable, a third able but not willing and Leo, the fourth, both unwilling and unable. A recent development in applied optics signals a change from a discrete to a continuous variable: lenses that shade imperceptibly from near to farsightedness. In his Moral Education, Durkheim (19): chapter makes much of biology as providing the best analogy and stimulus for the study of social systems.

These are but the scantiest, off-the-cuff examples of ways in which the sociologist as teacher can help students integrate their growing stock of knowledge with literature, history and the sciences. My point is that an adequate preparation for teaching demands of the sociologist a special command of the substance of sociology: a keen sense of connections between the particular and the general, between specialty and discipline, and between discipline and other intellectual realms. Only so can we touch the wider range of interests and backgrounds represented in classes containing most of the students we teach. Only so can we lend integrity (and retention) to what must otherwise be disconnected and unreinforced elements of the school's distribution requirements. Thus the sociologist's graduate

education should be one in which sensibilities are honed, enabling the prospective teacher to present a specialty against the backdrop of a larger whole. We might follow the example of the journalist-cartographer. In the maps of our special undertakings, we should learn to provide a larger, synoptic view by providing a small inset map showing the whole of sociology within which the blown-up segment (the specialty) is located. Beyond that, some scholarly sensitivity to our links with literature, history and the biophysical sciences will increase the effectiveness of our teaching, the wholeness of the student experience and the virtue of our field.

Extension

I think it was Floyd Allport who defined intelligence as the ability to respond to reduced cues. At the other pole, we deprecate the limited vision of the person who can't see beyond his nose. One of my favorite forefathers made a similar statement, one that could be taken as a guide in the education of sociologists for teaching. Ferguson (1767:49) wrote:

> . . . the degree of sagacity with which [a person] is endowed is to be measured by the success with which [he] is able to find general rules applicable to a variety of cases that seemed to have nothing in common, and to discover important distinctions between subjects which the vulgar are apt to confound.

Clearly general propositions are more powerful to the extent that they embrace a larger number of empirical instances. Clearly they are more interesting to the extent that the empirical instances differ, yet are discovered to be formally parallel. Is this not what we would wish for

our students, that they might learn to distill experience in telling propositions; and then to extend those propositions to other populations and circumstances? This requires, first, an accurate description of some piece of empirical reality: line workers, staff personnel, executive officers act repeatedly toward those in complementary roles in such and such a fashion. Analysis of repetitive behaviors reveals typical dimensions of such organizations: hierarchy of authority, impersonality, numbers or size and the like. General statements, then, about large corporations are extended, tentatively, to the Roman Catholic Church, the military, the city government of Boston and the University of Paris. (We might remind ourselves that this shift from empirical to analytical units and dimensions is a hallmark of useful research. For the move to a higher level of abstraction means that a wider range of empirical reality is subsumed, pointing to new possibilities for research--different populations and situations which nonetheless share the same analytical features.)

Such aspects of bureaucracy as impersonality, or a structure of authority are not accessible to the senses. They are abstractions built on inferences from the empirically observed actions of people who are dealing with one another. They are views from a distance. They are elements of theory. This suggests that, along the road to sociology instruction, graduate training in theory should attend, especially, to broadening the scope of implication of theoretical statements by extending them to analytically isomorphic situations. Thus the statement that identification with an organization is enhanced when its members are separated from the outside world applies to members of the People's Temple (who committed

suicide by the hundreds in the Guyana jungle), to the U.S. Marine Corps and to young people at a summer camp. Brainwashing and child rearing contain elements in common that shape the person to group demands: isolation from competing influences, repetitive indoctrination, the absence of supporting peers, the promise of acceptance and other rewards for satisfactory performance. In a study of 55 tribes, Whiting, Kluckhohn and Anthony (1958) concluded that protracted, intimate relationships between male child and mother were linked to violent initiation rites at puberty. The extension? They write (1958:370) that:

> . . . insofar as there has been an increase in juvenile delinquency in our society [rumbles, gang wars, rebellious defiance of authority, anxious demonstrations of virility] it should be accompanied by an increase in the exclusiveness of mother-child relationships and/or a decrease in the authority of the father. It is not unreasonable [to suppose] that industrialization and urbanization have done just this.

Similarly, a theory of minority-majority relations should drive us to investigate formal parallels between the genocide of European Jews and the Chinese in Indochina, especially in Vietnam; in the position of minorities in commercial activities--the Chinese in SE Asia, the Indians in Africa, the Parsees in India, the Protestants in France; and the plausibility of bracketing women and students with minorities, as Helen Hacker did, explicitly, with women (19) and Jerry Farber did in his book on The Student as Nigger ( ).

And so it seems to me that if we are to strengthen our students' powers of reflection, we must teach them the skill and the pleasure of

exploring potentially isomorphic social patterns. But for this to occur, their prospective teachers must have become self-consciously adept in moving from the concrete to such levels of abstraction as to embrace a wider range of empirical reality. It is likely to happen, in theory courses or those treating specific subfields, only if we are explicitly aware of the yield of such a process for teaching—and research.

Application

Extension brackets parallel forms. Application links the general with one or more of its specific instances. From a general knowledge of the concomitance of symptoms, the physician prescribes in the individual case. From general principles of the law, the case of the individual client is reviewed and a course of action specified. From certain propositions current in sociological lore, we predict outcomes in specific cases, or alter situations to improve the prospects of success.

Consider some examples bearing on our own work as teachers. We can predict with much better than chance accuracy the grades students will get on the basis of their chosen seats in the classroom. This is because we know something about the connection between physical and social distance, between core and periphery and the likelihood of having a stake in a given enterprise. And if the conception of our own success includes some learning on the part of those who seem, through their distance, to be resigning from the course, we will take action to reduce that distance and heighten frequency of interchange.

Because we know something about conditions for organizational success, we will know that selective recruitment increases chances of producing a desired outcome. And so we will manipulate entrance to the

course--more effectively than we now do--so improving the chances of shared purpose and achievement. If it is a large, heterogeneous, open admission course, we will attain the ends of selective recruitment by creating subdivisions having, within each, like ends and means.

Suppose we accept the social psychological principle that thought is engendered and emotion aroused only when the smooth, ongoing processes of life are disturbed. From this general proposition we will see that, for effective sociology instruction, we will often have to take the role of a benign disrupter. We will play the devil's advocate. We will present contradictory explanations of the same event, spurring students to seek a resolution. We will emphasize differences, and the need to explain them. With care, and by design, we will be disruptive (see Goldsmid and Wilson, 1980: Chapter V).

If students learn that active participation in decision-making is a condition of commitment to group goals, they will promote such participation in school committee meetings and, later, in political groups, projects of the League of Women Voters, the Urban League and the Rotary Club. If they learn the general distinction between ascribed and achieved status, they will be able to draw useful inferences not only about the consequences of a 10% advantage accorded veterans on civil service examinations, but also, in their own extended families, about the allocation of prestige and authority and, sometimes, the blurred lines between the two as inherited status creates opportunity for achieved status. If they become sensitive to the impact of unanticipated consequences, the notion of latent in contrast to manifest functions, they will ask about the adverse outcomes of good behaviors: an intimate relationship with an instructor, good

grades without demonstrated learning, open admissions without demonstrated motivation or preparation. And they will apply the idea, too, to explore the desirable outcomes of bad behaviors: a family disaster that strengthened ties among its members; the small community in which private affairs become public knowledge but which, nonetheless, make for low levels of theft and miscellaneous felonies.

There is an element of the pragmatic in this stress on skills of application--and extension and integration. It is putting knowledge to work in various ways. At the same time there is a strong cognitive and aesthetic element in weaving one's world together, in reaching out to embrace disparate chunks of reality within the same proposition; and in tapping a rich reservoir of insights into the social world to apply to new circumstances.

Integrating, extending and applying are mental processes employed by the reflective and capable human being. I take it as axiomatic that a chief aim of undergraduate instruction is to sharpen students' skills in integrating, extending and applying ideas. The teaching of sociology can contribute, distinctively, to these ends. But process is distinct from content; and I would like to conclude by saying something about the content of what is taught, as it points to needed scholarly preparation in graduate instruction.

I take for granted the vocational training that has characterized doctoral work--the preliminary work in calculus, set theory, statistics and the elaboration of such preliminaries in philosophy of science, categorical data analysis, survey procedures, the use of computers (interactive and batch processing), programming and the use of packaged programs

such as SPSS, data-gathering skills including participant observation and the like. Some of this training can be translated into saleable job skills for the undergraduate. But they are incidental to a liberal arts education (just as they are preliminaries to scientific work).

What is not incidental to an adequate undergraduate education are such processes as I've been discussing, crosscutting realms of life that inevitably generate perplexing problems in our students' lives. One such realm is, of course, that of work. But that is only one of many, and perhaps not the most important. It is a costly blunder to tie sociology to the market place, despite the practical pressures to do so. A sociology major from Purdue advocates a practical minor in such fields as business or computer programming and writes (Irving, 1978): "I can't stress this enough because, after all, people don't really enter college any more just for an education. They're in college for the purpose of getting a job after they graduate." Alas, students cannot know where they are going. They do not recognize that trade school training may be so specific as to become obsolete in a few, short years. They do not know that on-the-job training may be far more effective than schoolroom preparation. They do not appreciate that the specificity of vocational training restricts one's ability to deal with a broad range of unanticipated problems. Nor can they fully sense the increased significance of other realms of life. They are wrong and we are wrong in assenting to Beverly's view (1968:69, cited by Bill Ewens) to the effect that the "passage of large masses of the college educated into unskilled jobs [implies] a waste of the social resources employed in their training." Not so. It is all the more necessary for those in unskilled jobs (many of whom earn more than you or I) to enrich other realms of life

with the data and ideas that sociology can contribute to an undergraduate education. For the Eric Hoffer's of this world--and there are more than we recognize--it is vocational training that is a waste of resources. Specifically job relevant research skills plus ideas from the sociology of work make a diet far too restrictive for the discipline, far too thin for the student. Besides which, such vocational training can be better gotten on the job, or through intern programs or, to an extent we have not begun to realize, through carefully designed, self-paced, autodidactic schemes.

What realms, then, other than work, define the needed content of instruction and, by extension, the scholarly background appropriate for teachers of sociology? Certainly acts, thoughts and feelings are profoundly shaped by our parents, husbands, wives and children. It is at least plausible that the most creative act, for most of us, is the rearing of a child. To the extent that this is so, graduate training should anticipate, through research, theory and the discovery of resources, the critical differences in domestic arrangements, their sources and effects. Drawing data from their families of orientation and anticipating their families of procreation this would entail some thought about fertility and mortality, about dependence and independence, about gender roles, the allocation of authority and patterns of decision-making, the family's contribution to the state, characteristics of the life cycle, socialization processes and utopian forms of domestic life. No more than the work role should familial roles be taught as how-to-do-it exercises. The life of the mind is our concern, in that one interregnum when the young are freer to examine and explore than ever they will be again.

Sociology, in research and teaching, has always followed (seldom led)

changes in societal structure. The sociology of sports, or sociology of leisure reflect remarkable changes in our society. A paper by Johnson and Cuzzort (unpublished) informs me that working men spend about two-thirds as much time viewing TV as they do on the job. Sports used to be seasonal; now they span ever more months of the year. They were once largely amateur. Now they are increasingly professionalized, their training geared to film and computer analyses, their operations geared to profit. Add to sport, television, radio, theater; add jogging and ballet and cinema; add tapes and discs and videotapes; add books, magazines and papers; and tennis, boating, fishing, swimming, sailing; then add scores of hobbies: they sum to a sizeable segment of social life. Shall we ask if, as in ancient Rome, these entertainments serve the social function assigned by Marx to religion? Shall we examine commercial entertainment as an institutionalized pattern peculiarly describing U.S. social life? Shall we take the perspective of the social psychologist and link types of organized play with types of personal predispositions? These are rhetorical questions. This is a vast domain of our social lives. It is engrossing. It is not only fair game; it is a central sphere of contemporary social life. And it is salient for our students. A former graduate student once wrote (Goldsmid & Wilson, 1980:III-20):

> One thing I've learned this year is that a surprisingly high percentage of students respond to illustrations from the world of sports. . . . This semester the class period I feel best about is one in which I used Schwartz and Barsky's article (1977) about the home advantage for a discussion of sociological methods. . . .

The same young colleague, now Professor Paul Lindsay of UNC-G, also discovered this statement of Novak's (1976:33). He is speaking of Professor Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, at Harvard, who

> observed . . . that his references to European stories, historical or legendary, did not illuminate for Americans the points he was making, as they [had] for his students in Germany. He tried for several years to find a field of examples of which his American students would have vivid personal experience. Later he wrote: "The world in which the American student who comes to me at about twenty years of age really has confidence is the world of sport. This world encompasses all of his virtues and experiences, affection and interests; therefore, I have built my entire sociology around the experiences an American has in athletics and games.

Although inevitably students will perform in the civic role, it is not so preoccupying for so many as family, work and play. On the other hand, young people are now eligible to vote at 18. Their lives and life chances are conditioned by the law: school requirements, the license to drive, insurance rates peculiar to the young, minimum wage laws, the legality of unions that institutionalizes periodic conflicts over the rewards of work, social security deductions and the like. There is, further--and now for women as well as men--the option of military service. A year ago there were 2,043,000 persons in uniform and an additional 800,000 in the reserves (see Janowitz and Moskos, 1979). The military is becoming a large, permanent sector of the labor force, perhaps with special meaning for college youth. The composition of the military by age, race, region and class tells us something (as does the tax system) about the distribution

of civic contributions. The social structure of a ship's crew, or of an infantry regiment tells us worlds about stratification and the conditions that enforce or erode that system. Adequate preparation for teaching sociology would surely entail a study of the way students are caught up in the civic role.

As a final illustration, let us remember that for most of their lives our students have been--students. But they will not have viewed their induction into the secrets of society from the perspective of a sociologist. This experience, hitherto unexploited, is one we can use if we are prepared to do so. Through it we can get a vivid sense of the meaning of bureaucratic organization. We can uncover the interlocking character of social institutions, of college and university with the realms of work, the family, religion, polity and play. We can uncover the power structure, the structure of rewards and their degree of congruence with ability. (For public universities, salaries as well as rank are available data; and so are publications.) We can study the effect on local communities of a regular infusion and rapid turnover of aliens, those not locally socialized and having no strong stake in the local community. We can raise questions about social change, evolutionary or revolutionary, in communities with permeable boundaries (in contrast to those that grow from within, with control over the socialization of those who move into adult niches). We can raise questions about selective admission, retention and loss, as these processes distinguish colleges from the military or business organizations. Indeed, recalling the telling term we use, the educational system, we can tackle any of the questions appropriate to the analysis of any social system, so joining the student's familiar world with the perspective

peculiar to sociology.

All this is to say that, about matters of content, we should ask two questions: What are the immediate and direct ways in which college students' lives are socially shaped? (Many of us cannot answer this question from our own experience; for we are too remote from our students in age, or class, or race or sex.) And a second question: How can these immediate influences be exploited in the service of sociology instruction?

* * *

What then is entailed when we ask about scholarly preparation for teaching sociology? When I look at desired outcomes for our students I see certain processes as desirable, and certain content as useful means. Some capacity to integrate knowledge, to extend and apply it seems to me the hallmark of an educated person. When I speak of integrity, I do not mean a rigid, cognitive or ideological fundamentalism. Experience is enlarged. People grow. I do mean that meaning emerges against some configuration of life experiences; and that good preparation for teaching sociology encourages this process of fitting parts together, of seeing, however tentatively, some whole. This sets the specialty within the discipline. It sets the discipline within the larger range of human knowledge. Without some capacity for extension, our students will never feel the exhilaration of recognizing that a given event is, in fact, one of a larger class: that the student who, in asking for more time, reporting that another professor has already concurred; that the child who plays one parent off against another; that the English Raj who favors now the Hindu, now the Moslem; that the U.S. in its relations to China and the U.S.S.R.--

that all of these are instances of shifting alliances within those triadic forms that Simmel discussed so perceptively. Extension gives us more leverage on a world otherwise fractured into unintelligible bits. And application, especially when action taken in accordance with a principle produces the predicted outcomes, is the real test of the power of a mind.

Do we prepare our graduate students to integrate, extend and apply? Probably not, or not wittingly and with the end in view of vivifying sociology for our students and strengthening the discipline in the minds of those fleetingly exposed to it.

Finally, in thining of desired outcomes as content, I've tried to make two points. For scholarly preparation for teaching sociology we have, first, to view our students as we would research subjects, trying to understand the social world they live in. Understanding and exploiting the world of the student (which is our world, too, although we do -not live so fully in it) is the crucial means for effective instruction. For as Mead has taught us, "we do not know what we are saying to students unless we can respond to our utterances as they will." (See Goldsmid and Wilson, 1980: III-21.)

The student's world--to make my second point--is not a world that requires sociology to provide vocational training, although generic and saleable skills should be assumed as part of the outcomes for a sociology major. It is a world with other compelling interests--in love and family and children; a world of sports and games and entertainment; a world shot through, increasingly , with formal controls and institutionalized enmities; it is a world of schooling that has enveloped two-thirds to three-fourths of their lives, yet a world they have never seen objectively (although they have much of the data that would permit them to do so).

To fix on processes and content peculiarly pertinent for undergraduate education requires careful planning for a revised doctoral program. But that program is already overstuffed and demanding. Especially is this so with compensatory technical training. I suggest that we now have a splendid chance to solve the problem by reducing the number of our recruits for graduate training, accepting only those with the essential preliminary work in mathematics and methods; and for the remedial or compensatory training that we now practice, substitute education in the skills of integrating, extending and applying the lore of sociology. This would improve our research as well as our teaching. And I suggest that, like good sociologists, we devote some of the graduate program to a study of the social world of those we are about to teach, preparing to illuminate that world with the facts and insights that sociology alone can convey.

NOTES

1. By "softer aspirants" I mean those whose aspirations were to help people. There is a story, if apocryphal yet quite in character, about Louis Wirth's response to young students wishing to major in sociology because they wanted to help, or work with people. L.W. growled in response: "Sociology doesn't give a damn about people."

2. This time of contracting demand for sociologists might be particularly propitious for selecting for graduate training those fewer whose background would permit a lesser emphasis (but at a more advanced level) on technical matters.

3. The proliferation of topics at professional meetings has plagued program organizers at ASA and regional meetings. Sessions have multiplied owing to increases in membership and the volume, therefore, of scholarly work. But the multiplication of proposed sessions and topics is partly a result of some sociologists' inability to articulate their particular sorts of work with longstanding, generic issues in the field. They must pass on to students a grab bag conception of the field, lacking, therefore, any persuasive raison d'etre.

4. An article in the New York Times (Hechinger, August 14, 1979: C4) speaks to this issue. It is based on a CIA report on education in the USSR, saying, among other things: "Soviet higher education has been characterized by a narrow curriculum, which made it difficult for specialists to cope with technological change." Hechinger comments that 'the latest Soviet reforms stress training in the basic rather than the applied sciences, particularly mathematics and physics, and are even offering broader social science instruction for students preparing for technical specialities.'

REFERENCES

Auchincloss, Louis. The Rector of Justin. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
1964

Beverly, John. "Higher Education and the Capitalist Crisis." Socialist
1968 Review 8 (November-December), 67-90

Butler, Samuel. The Way of All Flesh. N.Y.: Macmillan
1925

Conrad, Joseph. The Heart of Darkness. (orig. pbld. 1902 in Youth: A
1902 Narrative and 2 other Stories, Doubleday)

Durkheim, Emile. Moral Education. Trans. E. K. Wilson & H. Schnurer
1925 N.Y.: Free Press. 1961

Ferguson, Adam. An Essay on the History of Civil -Society (8th ed.)
1767 Philadelphia: A. Finley, Publisher, 1819.

Goldsmid, Charles A. and Everett K. Wilson. Passing on Sociology
1980 Belmont, California: Wadsworth

Hoffer, Eric
19

Irving, Laurelyn E., C. Ronald Huff and John M. Stahura. "Putting
1978 Sociology to Work: An Assessment of Graduates' And Employers'
Needs for Improving the Occupational Relevance of Sociology."
Mimeographed, Purdue University Department of Sociology & Anthropology

Johnson, and Ray Cuzzort. "Entertainment in American Society."
1979 Mimeographed

Moliere, Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme

Novak, M. The Joy of Sports: End Zones, Bases, Baskets, Balls and the
1976 Consecration of the American Spirit. N.Y.: Basic Books

Tolstoy, Leo. War and Peace. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. N.Y.:
19 Oxford University Press

Troyat, Henri. Tolstoy. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday
1967

Schwartz, Barry and Barsky. "The Home Advantage." Social Forces
1977

von Thünen, Die Isolierte Stadt im Beziehung des Hinterlands
19

Whiting, John W. M., Clyde Kluckhohn and Richadd Anthony. "The Function
1958 of Male Initiation Ceremonies at Puberty," in Eleanor Maccoby, Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley, Readings in Social Psychology. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 359-70.

Wilson, Everett K. Sociology: Rules, Roles and Relationships. Homewood, Ill.:
1971 The Dorsey Press

Woodward, C. Vann. The Strange Case of Jim Crow.
19